

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 STATE 098540

71

ORIGIN PM-07

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ADP-00 NSC-10 MBFR-03 DODE-00 SS-15

SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 H-02 ACDA-19 OMB-01 /113 R

DRAFTED BY PM/ DCA: TWSIMONS, JR.: NSC: DAARON: SAC

5/22/73

APPROVED BY D/ MBFR: RISPIERS, ACTING

EUR - MR. SPRINGSTEEN

EUR/ RPM - MCGUIRE/ STREATOR

PM/ DCA - MR. MARTIN

ACDA/ IR - MR. LINEBAUGH

OSD/ ISA - MR. BARTHOLOMEW

JCS/ J-5 - BGEN. GEORGI

S/ S- O: W. NEWLIN

NSC - DAARON (IN SUB)

----- 005489

O R 230100 Z MAY 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

S E C R E T STATE 098540

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT, VIENNA FOR MBFR DEL

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 098540

SUBJECT: MBFR: GUIDANCE FOR MAY 23 DISCUSSION OF GUIDELINES

REF: A. STATE 96493; B. NATO 2461; C. NATO 2462; D. NATO 2494 - -

1. IN KEEPING WITH OUR VIEW (REF A) THAT GUIDELINES EXERCISE SHOULD HAVE SUBORDINATE AND FACILITATIVE ROLE IN MAJOR TASK OF DEVELOPING ALLIANCE NEGOTIATING POSITION FOR FALL, YOU SHOULD BE GUIDED IN DISCUSSIONS OF SPC TEXT (REF B) BY TWO PRIMARY CONSIDERATIONS:

(A) IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAVE GUIDELINES/ PRINCIPLES DEBATE BEHIND US AS WE ENGAGE IN PRACTICAL SUMMER WORK OF FORMULATING POION. FYI. W WOULD HOPE THAT PRUDENCE AND CAUTION CHARACTERIZING US APPROACH PRESENTED MAY 2 WOULD ALLAY FEARS AS TO US INTENTIONS WHICH MAY IN PAST HAVE LED SOME ALLIES TO SEEK PRINCIPLES DEBATE AS STALLING DEVICE. END FYI. THUS, IF SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT ON SATISFACTORY TEXT CAN BE ACHIEVED IN TIME FOR MINISTERS IN COPENHAGEN TO TAKE NOTE OF DOCUMENT AND INSTRUCT COUNCIL IN PERMANENT SESSION TO DEVELOP NEGOTIATING POSITION TAKING ACCOUNT OF GUIDELINES, WE WOULD WELCOME THIS CONCLUSION.

(B) ON THE OTHER HAND, WE DO NOT BELIEVE THIS TEXT IS APPROPRIATE VEHICLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILED ALLIANCE MBFR POSITION, NOR WOULD WE WISH TO SEE GAP- TYPE DEBATE ON GUIDELINES WHICH MIGHT BLUR ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS IN EFFORT TO WORK LANGUAGE AND UNDULY ABSORB THE POLICY AND PERSONNEL ENERGIES WHICH WILL BE NEEDED TO REACH DECISIONS ON THE SPECIFICS OF AN MBFR OUTCOME AND AN MBFR NEGOTIATING POSITION, INCLUDING AN APPROACH TO REDUCTIONS, ACCEPTABLE TO THE ALLIES. THUS, YOU SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT WE BELIEVE AGREEMENT ON TEXT EXPRESSING WHATEVER CONSENSUS IS ACHIEVABLE ON PRINCIPLES/ GUIDELINES AND FLAGGING WHATEVER DIFFERENCES REMAIN WOULD PROVIDE A USEFUL WORKING DOCUMENT BUT THAT DEVELOPMENT OF TEXT IN OUR VIEW WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL IF IT IMPEDES PROGRESS ON THE CENTRAL TASK FACING US.

2. IN THE MAY 23 DISCUSSIONS, YOU SHOULD EMPHASIZE IMPORTANCE OF COMING TO GRIPS WITH SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES AND NOT SIMPLY DEVISING LANGUAGE WHICH PAPERS OVER DIFFERENCES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 098540

IN VIEW OF NEED FOR NAC CONSIDERATION OF THESE ISSUES AND THE FACT THAT NOT ALL SENIOR POLADS HAD BENEFIT OF INSTRUCTIONS FROM CAPITALS IN DEVELOPING GUIDELINES TEXT, YOU SHOULD URGE THAT NAC DEFER DECISIONS ON TEXT PENDING NAC DISCUSSION OF ISSUES AND FURTHER INSTRUCTED WORK IN SPC.

3. GUIDELINES DRAFT RAISES FOLLOWING MAJOR SUBSTANTIVE

ISSUES WHICH WE BELIEVE SHOULD BE ADDRESSED BY NAC.

(A). STATIONED VERSUS INDIGENOUS FORCES: WE APPRECIATE THAT THIS ISSUE WILL REQUIRE HIGH LEVEL DECISION IN GOVERNMENTS. WE, THEREFORE, BELIEVE THERE SHOULD BE THOROUGH INSTRUCTED DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES INVOLVED BY PERMREPS. WE HAVE MADE KNOWN OUR VIEWS AND CANNOT REFINED THEM FURTHER WITHOUT THE ALLIES SETTING FORTH THEIR VIEWS.

(B) AREA VERSUS AREAS: THE QUESTION OF THE EXTENT OF THE AREA OF COVERAGE FOR MBFR PROVTSYO4 S IS CLFARLY A MAJOR ISSUE FOR THE FRG AND PERHAPS OTHERS. AGAIN, WE HAVE CONVEYED OUR VIEWS. WE UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM THAT CONCERNS THE FRG, BUT DO NOT KNOW HOW GERMANS WOULD PROPOSE TO DEAL WITH IT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. SIMPLY KEEPING THE ISSUES OPEN IN REGARD, FOR EXAMPLE, TO A CONSTRAINTS AREA DIFFERENT FROM THE REDUCTION AREA AS PROPOSED IN THE TEXT OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE WILL NOT HELP US DEVELOP A POSITION OVER THE SUMMER. WHAT CONCRETE PROPOSALS DO THE ALLIES HAVE IN THIS REGARD? THEY SHOULD BE PUT FORWARD AND ADDRESSED ON THEIR MERITS.

(C) VERIFICATION: US HAS MOVED BEYOND FORMULATION IN DRAFT GUIDELINES. AS NOTED IN OUR BASIC PAPER, THE US BELIEVES THAT WE CANNOT ACCEPT ANY PROPOSAL FOR MBFR WHICH

WOULD DEPEND CRITICALLY ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF NEGOTIATED VERIFICATION MEASURES TO MAINTAIN UNDIMINISHED SECURITY, AND THAT WE MUST BE PREPARED TO RELY ON NATIONAL MEANS FOR VERIFICATION FOR ANY PROPOSALS WE ADVANCE OR A
E E E E E E E

*** Current Handling Restrictions *** n/a

*** Current Classification *** SECRET

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts:
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE098540
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: TWSIMONS, JR.: NSC: DAARON: SAC
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: RR
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: SECSTATE WASHDC
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730552/aaaajpui.tel
Line Count: 144
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN PM
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A.STATE 96493, B.NATO 2461, C.NATO 2462, D.NATO, 2494
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 20 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <19-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 980227
Subject: MBFR: GUIDANCE FOR MAY 23 DISCUSSION OF GUIDE- LINES
TAGS: PARM, XG, NATO
To: HELSINKI
NATO
SALT TALKS
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE

VIENNA

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005